



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,427	03/18/2002	Masato Watabe	220942US3 XPCT	1487

22850 7590 05/03/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

GLESSNER, BRIAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3635

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/070,427

Applicant(s)

WATABE ET AL.

Examiner

Brian E. Glessner

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15 and 16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,11,13 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The following office action is in response to the amendment filed on April 18, 2005. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 13 and 14 stand rejected as set forth below, claims 2 and 12 remain objected to, claims 15 and 16 remain allowable and claims 5-10 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 10

Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa (JP 01197296 A) in view of Saino (1,195,505).

In regard to claims 1 and 11, Yoshikawa discloses an elevator system comprising an elevator opening, an elevator hall door 11 for closing and opening the elevator opening on an elevator hall, said elevator hall door comprising a door panel comprising a surface board 10 for facing the elevator hall, a back board 8 for facing the elevator opening, and a reinforcing member 9 for reinforcing said surface and back boards; and first and second fasteners 15 configured to connect said back board to said surface board or said reinforcing member, wherein at least a part of said second fastener is configured to lose the force of constraint against said surface board or said reinforcing member on high temperature conditions during a fire. The examiner would like to point out that all metals are capable of melting at certain high temperatures. Therefore, the metal fasteners 15 connecting the panel 10 to the panel 8 and reinforcing members 9 will melt at a certain temperature thereby losing force of constraint against the boards. Yoshikawa does not specifically disclose that said second fastener is configured to lose its force of constraint before said first fastener. Saino teaches that it is known to provide

Art Unit: 3635

a first fastener 23 and a second fastener 17, wherein the second fastener is configured to lose its force of constraint before said first fastener. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this teaching into Yoshikawa's invention, because, as taught by Saino, the force of constraint can be released, but one will not have to worry about the door coming apart, page 3, lines 66-72.

In regard to claims 3 and 13, Yoshikawa discloses the basic claimed invention except for specifically disclosing that the first (claim 13) or second (claim 3) connecting member comprises a rivet having a smaller head than a rivet hole that is formed in a connecting portion of said back board, and said second connecting member comprises a plastic or rubber washer that is provided between said head of said rivet and said back board. Saino teaches that it is known to use a door that comprises a bolt 23 having a smaller head than a slot 25, and a second connecting member that has a fusible washer 24 provided between said head of said bolt and a board a. However, Saino does not specifically disclose that said bolt is a rivet, that said washer is rubber or plastic, or that said washer and head are located adjacent said back board. Saino does disclose that bolts and rivets are interchangeable, page 2, lines 55-56 and 102-104.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use either a bolt or a rivet since Saino teaches that both types of fasteners are well known in the art. Further, in regard to the location of the parts, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the bolt through the panel in the reverse direction, since it has been held that a mere reversal of

Art Unit: 3635

the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Saino's fastening devices into Yoshikawa's invention, because Saino's fastening devices will work in a more efficient manner to allow the elevator door to expand in the event of a fire.

In regard to claims 4 and 14, Yoshikawa discloses the claimed invention except for specifically disclosing that said first (claim 14) or said second (claim 4) fastener member comprises a bolt, and said second fastener (claim 14) member comprises a resin or rubber nut that forms a counterpart to said bolt. Saino teaches that the use of a fire door having a connecting member 23 that is a bolt. However, Saino does not specifically disclose the use of a resin or rubber nut attached to the bolt. However, Saino does disclose the use of a fusible washer 24 that melts when exposed to heat to allow the bolt to pass through the slot. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a rubber or resin nut on the end of Saino's bolt instead of a fusible washer, since a rubber or resin nut would be functionally equivalent to the fusible washer. Both the fusible washer and the rubber or resin nut will melt when exposed to fire to allow said bolt to pass through said slot. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Saino's fastening devices into Yoshikawa's invention, because Saino's fastening devices will work in a more efficient manner to allow the elevator door to expand in the event of a fire.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 15 and 16 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 13 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian E. Glessner whose telephone number is 571-272-6843. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman can be reached on 571-272-6842. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Brian E. Glessner
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3635

B.G.
April 28, 2005